

Remarks

The Office Action mailed August 10, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-22 are now pending in this application. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter.

The rejection of claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ciesko et al. (U.S. Patent 5,949,027) ("Ciesko") is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a cable management system having "a patch panel having a first connectivity interface configured to connect with cables," and "a wire manager located proximate said patch panel, said wire manager having a body with a curved interior contour defining a cavity configured to hold cables, said wire manager being oriented in a non-orthogonal relation to said patch panel such that said body extends at a non-orthogonal angle from said first connectivity interface."

Ciesko does not describe nor suggest a cable management system including a patch panel having a first connectivity interface configured to connect with cables. Ciesko is silent with respect to such a structure. Rather, Ciesko merely describes a cable management ring that connects to an electronics enclosure. Additionally, Applicants respectfully traverse the suggestion in the Office Action, at page 2, that the recitation of the patch panel in claim 1 is merely a "recitation with respect to the manner in which the claimed apparatus is intended to be employed..." In contrast, the patch panel of claim 1 is a structural element not shown or described in Ciesko. As such, Ciesko fails to teach each and every element of the claimed cable management system.

Moreover, Ciesko does not describe nor suggest a wire manager being oriented in a non-orthogonal relation to a patch panel such that a body of the wire manager extends at a non-orthogonal angle from a first connectivity interface of the patch panel. Rather, Ciesko describes a cable management ring that is mounted to an electronics enclosure by an attachment device.

Additionally, the cable management ring extends perpendicularly with respect to the electronics enclosure.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Ciesko.

Claims 8, 9 and 12 depend from independent claim 1. When the recitations of claims 8, 9 and 12 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent claims 8, 9 and 12 likewise are patentable over Ciesko.

Claim 14 recites a wire manager for retaining cables in a cable management system having a connectivity interface configured to connect with cables, wherein the wire manager includes “side walls, at least one of said side walls being configured to be located proximate the connectivity interface of the cable management system”, “a front wall joined to said side walls”, and “a back wall joined to said side walls, said front, back and side walls surrounding a cavity having a curved interior contour, said front and back walls extending at non-orthogonal angles from said side wall located proximate the connectivity interface such that said front and back walls extend at a non-orthogonal angle from the connectivity interface when the wire manager is located proximate the connectivity interface.”

Ciesko does not describe nor suggest a wire manager having a side walls being configured to be located proximate a connectivity interface of a cable management system. Rather, Ciesko merely describes a cable management ring that connects to an electronics enclosure, and Ciesko is silent with respect to a connectivity interface. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 14 is submitted to be patentable over Ciesko.

Claims 15-16, 18, 19, 21 and 22 depend from independent claim 14. When the recitations of claims 15-16, 18, 19, 21 and 22 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 14, Applicants submit that dependent claims 15-16, 18, 19, 21 and 22 likewise are patentable over Arnett.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, 21 and 22 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jay J. Hoette", written over a horizontal line.

Jay J. Hoette

Registration No. 50,666

ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP

One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600

St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740

(314) 621-5070